

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**

Application No. 10,542,237, Sugimoto et al.  
Request for Reconsideration dated May 14, 2004  
Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2004

requirement. The apparatus claims were allowed over the prior art now being applied against the pending claims.

The rejection of claims 9-11 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nishida (U.S. Patent No. 5,858,806) in view of Inaba et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,243,755, hereinafter "Inaba"), JP 11-54877 and Takeshita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,458,236 B2, hereinafter "Takeshita") is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, it is noted that Inaba is not properly combinable with Nishida, as they are directed to entirely different fields of endeavor. Thus, there is no motivation to combine the references to arrive at the claimed invention. However, even if, *arguendo*, the combination were deemed proper, the combination nevertheless fails to render the claimed invention obvious. The impropriety of combining Inaba with Nishida or Takeshita is discussed in detail below following substantive discussion of the rejection. It is also noted that the rejection lists JP 11-54877 in the combination, but does not apply this reference in the rejection. Thus, this alleged prior art will not be discussed herein.

The Office Action concedes that Nishida fails to disclose, teach or suggest, among other things, controlling the stretch amount caused by thermocompression, as set forth in the independent claims. In an effort to overcome this fundamental deficiency of Nishida, the Office Action alleges that the claimed step of controlling of the stretch amount is taught by the disclosure of Inaba. This is

simply incorrect. In particular, Inaba is directed to a heater head for an inkjet printer. The citation in the Office Action to Figure 32(b) does not, as alleged in the Office Action, pertain to a controller structure for adjusting the pressing or having programability, but is instead is a block diagram showing an arrangement for a control portion *of the head nozzle*, and has nothing to do with the construction of the head nozzle or for controlling the construction the inkjet head. Moreover, this structure has nothing to do with the claimed method of bonding by thermocompression.

Moreover, the reference Takeshita fails to overcome this fundamental deficiency. Therefore, even if, *arguendo*, the combination of Nishida with Inaba and Takeshita were proper, the combination nevertheless fails to render the claimed invention obvious.

As set forth above, the proposed combination of Inaba with Nishida is improper. Nishida is directed to the field of IC component bonding. Inaba is directed to a heater head for an inkjet printer. The citation in the Office Action to Figure 32(b) does not, as alleged in the Office Action, pertain to a controller structure for adjusting the pressing or having programability, but is instead is a block diagram showing an arrangement for a control portion *of the head nozzle*, and has nothing to do with the construction of the head nozzle or for controlling the construction the inkjet head. Additionally, it is clear that Inaba is not

analogous art, and as such, is not properly combinable with Nishida in the manner proposed in the Office Action. As set forth above, Inaba is directed to assembly of ink jet heads, and not to the claimed manufacturing techniques. As noted by the Court in *In re Pagliaro, Franklin and Pagliaro*, 210 U.S.P.Q. 888, 892 (C.C.P.A., 1981), an inventor is presumed to have knowledge of all prior art in his field of endeavor, but with regard to knowledge in art outside the field of his endeavor, he is only presumed to have knowledge in art areas which are reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved. The court thus set forth a two-pronged test to determine whether a prior art reference is analogous. First, it must be determined whether the reference was within the field of the inventors' endeavor. If it is not, it must be determined whether the reference is reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was involved.

It is respectfully submitted that Inaba fails both prongs of the *Pagliaro* test. In particular, Inaba is not directed to the field of mounting flexible boards onto display boards, and specifically to an apparatus and method for connecting a terminal electrode of a thin film transistor liquid crystal display and a terminal electrode of a tape carrier package of a flexible printed circuit board mounted on a large scale integrated package. Instead, Inaba is directed to the very divergent field of assembly of ink jet heads for inkjet printers. Thus, those skilled in the art

to which the present invention pertains cannot properly be presumed to have had knowledge of the assembly of ink jet heads for inkjet printers. Moreover, Inaba fails to address, in any respect, the problems to which the present invention pertains. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Inaba of the problems associated with thermocompression, and in particular controlling stretch amount caused thereby. Accordingly, Inaba is non-analogous art, and is thus not properly combinable with Nishida under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the references to Inaba and Takeshita fail to overcome this fundamental deficiencies noted with respect to Nishida. In particular, none of the cited references disclose, teach or suggest the claimed stretch amount controlling means. Thus, even if, *arguendo*, the combination of Nishida, Takeshita and Inaba were proper (which it is respectfully submitted is not the case), the combination nevertheless fails to render the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the entire application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of the application and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Application No. 10,042,237, Sugimoto et al.  
Request for Reconsideration dated May 14, 2004  
Response to Office Action dated February 24, 2004

Should the Examiner deem that further issues require resolution prior to allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney of record at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

**NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.**

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Updeep S. Gill  
Reg. No. 37,334

USG:jsm  
1100 North Glebe Road, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Arlington, VA 22201-4714  
Telephone: (703) 816-4000  
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100